

contribute constructively to this process in the coming weeks rather than resorting to the obstructionist tactics which have so dominated Washington for the last 8 months. I hope a new day of compromise is dawning.

#### REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on the eve of September 11, I would ask that we all remember this: The challenges we face as a Nation, whether threats to our security or to our economic security, are the same. Our Nation's security and our economic security are tied together.

This Sunday, my fellow Nevadans and I and the rest of the Nation will join in a remembrance to the tragic events of that fateful day 10 years ago, and we will mourn the thousands of innocent lives lost in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. We will never forget the events of that Tuesday morning, which dawned so clear. It was a bright blue sky that ended gloomy and dark.

But we should also remember the spirit of unity and determination that blossomed amidst the darkness of that day. In the weeks and months that followed, we were not Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, red States and blue States, we were Americans. Beneath the partisanship of Washington, that is as true today as it was 10 years ago. It doesn't mean we will not disagree. In fact, the same freedom that allows us to disagree is also the root of our democracy. But it does mean we must work together in the best interests of this great Nation and in the interests of every man or woman who calls America home, no matter how difficult.

Today, the greatest challenge facing this Nation is putting 14 million Americans back to work and returning some prosperity to our economy. I look forward to tackling that challenge as one Nation. We need to join together in that cause.

Mr. President, would you announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to make my remarks immediately thereafter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Utah. I will be very brief. I will actually be propitious in many ways. I am here at a time when the Senator from Virginia is the Presiding Officer.

Last night there was a focus on a short-term stimulus. I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Georgia who have led efforts over the course of the last many months to focus on trying to deal with our longer term issues. I think there are many of us in this body, as well as in the House of Representatives, who believe the best way for us to deal with our short-term economic situation is to deal with the long-term structural issues that are affecting our country so much.

So I am here today to express hope and to say I feel a tremendous consensus building. I know the Presiding Officer and I were in a meeting earlier this week where I think there was demonstrated a lot of consensus by Republicans and Democrats in the Senate toward using this supercommittee and encouraging the supercommittee. There was tremendous optimism expressed about what this supercommittee is getting ready to do. But we wish to encourage them to look at a number of deficit reduction ideas which may be twice or even more than the original charge and, secondarily, to encourage them to use this tremendous opportunity for tax reform, much like was laid out in many of the Bowles-Simpson concepts, and to have Medicare entitlement reform as part of that; and, thirdly—and this is me speaking individually, although I think there is consensus building around this too—to do something longer term as it relates to infrastructure, such as having a 6-year highway bill. I feel that momentum building in the House. I think it exists in the Senate.

The reason I am on the Senate floor today is to say one thing. We have a tremendous opportunity to deal with our long-term issues which will immediately affect our economy now and stimulate it, if we will do that. I hope what we will not do is become sidetracked on issues that are more around the edges, more around the fringe, issues that are short-term in nature. The Presiding Officer, who has created jobs in his lifetime, and I have done the same thing in my lifetime, and I under-

stand it is important to create a long-term environment where people have confidence that we have actually dealt with this country's problems. There is nothing—nothing—that could be more stimulative in the short term than for people to see that this body and the body across the way on the other side of the Capitol have dealt with these issues in an appropriate way.

I am encouraging us to stay focused, to stay focused on the supercommittee, to continue to encourage them to do even more than what is their charge. I think there is a lot of consensus around that, and I am thankful to be a part of that encouragement.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank again the senior Senator from Utah for his tremendous courtesy and certainly his leadership on so many of these issues. I thank the Senator very much.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. He is one of the more prescient people in this body, and we all care a great deal for him. I appreciate his leadership in this great body.

#### REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I remember September 11, 2001, as if it were yesterday. I was here in my office at my desk when the unthinkable happened. I remember driving to the Senate that morning thinking it was such a beautiful day. It was a crisp fall morning with a remarkable blue sky. Over the years, I have often wondered how such resplendence could occur amid such evil and suffering. I take solace in knowing that nearly 3,000 innocent victims, including 3 Utahns, hopefully touched the face of God that day.

Yet since that horrible day, Americans have once again risen to the challenge. As President George W. Bush said 3 months after the attacks:

Our enemies have made the mistake that America's enemies always make. They saw liberty and thought they saw weakness.

But 10 years on, Americans have shown, once again, our resolve can never be broken. When confronted by evil, we will not yield.

I remember on that day I came over here to the Senate, and we were told to evacuate the Capitol. As we walked out—some running as fast as they could—and walked down the steps of the Senate side of the Capitol, I turned around and saw that Senator Helms was back up on the veranda, and he was having difficulties, as he did in his later years, with ambulation, and I walked back up the steps, and he leaned on my arm as we came down the steps and were among the last to leave the Capitol at that time. We were warned there might be a plane flying into the Capitol or into the White House, and it was a matter of great concern to everybody.

But 10 years later, as I have said, Americans have once again shown the

resolve that is necessary. We have confronted evil, and we will continue to do so, and we will never yield.

We, as a nation, continue to stand up to this threat and we have done much to overcome it. But we should never become complacent.

As the 9/11 Commission's recent report card on the implementation of its recommendations clearly shows, we have made important advances in securing the homeland, but a lot of work needs to be accomplished.

Some of the most profound changes, and also some of the least understood, have occurred in our intelligence community. For example, the 16 different agencies which constitute our intelligence community are collaborating as never before. Part of that is because of the PATRIOT Act, which requires that type of collaboration. The PATRIOT Act has worked very well, and even though there are some on the far right and the far left who do not accept the PATRIOT Act, I have to tell you it has worked amazingly well in helping us to protect our homeland.

As the Commission pointed out, collaboration in the intelligence community was essential to the success of the raid which killed Osama bin Laden. That was 10 years later, but it sent a message to the world that we are not going to quit until we find these people, root them out, and get rid of them.

In addition, I also believe our Nation is much safer due to the Terrorist Surveillance Program. The Terrorist Surveillance Program enables our intelligence agencies to monitor international communications from al-Qaida. This initiative has been the subject of much debate in Congress. However, the legislative compromise which was reached, I believe, strikes a proper balance by permitting our intelligence agencies to operate in an efficient manner while strengthening the oversight role of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which has worked amazingly well.

However, the need for improvements still remains. The Commission notes that over the past 6 years we have had four Directors of National Intelligence. As many managers would agree, such leadership changes will disrupt the implementation of any organization's modernization strategy. Yet in the realm of counterterrorism, the slightest misstep could be exploited by our foes to launch another attack.

Other areas which require immediate attention include securing our borders. An important tool in helping us verify the identity of visitors to the United States is our biometric entry system, called US-VISIT. Unfortunately, the security offered by this system is incomplete. As the Commission pointed out, US-VISIT does not yet have a fully operational system to record when visitors leave our Nation. Such a capability is not only useful in tracking terrorists but is also an important capability in stemming illegal immigration.

That is why I have introduced S. 332, the Strengthening Our Commitment to Legal Immigration and America's Security Act. This bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to create a mandatory exit procedure for foreign visitors to our country, the United States of America. Unfortunately, my optimism regarding Afghanistan, the planning ground and safe haven for those who plotted the attacks of September 11, has somewhat receded.

The surge of forces has led to great gains in the southern Afghan provinces of Helmand and Kandahar. This is the heartland of the Taliban. According to GEN David Rodriguez, who until recently was our Deputy Commander in Afghanistan, the Taliban "enjoyed near total control" of these areas as recently as 2009. Moreover, our additional forces enabled the implementation of a robust counterinsurgency strategy. This means we had sufficient forces not only to clear an area of the Taliban but to hold it. As a result, we were able to provide security to the local population, assist in the development of the primarily agrarian economy, and train Afghani security forces.

Unfortunately, the President's arbitrary decision to reduce the number of our forces deployed to Afghanistan by approximately a third, and instructing the reduction to be completed by next summer, only adds to the burden of our forces that remain.

In fact, this summer I was fortunate to host former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, GEN Michael Hayden, at a speaking event in Utah. I found his insight on this matter most illuminating. General Hayden did not quarrel with the notion of reducing the number of troops in Afghanistan. However, he was troubled by the timing of the drawdown. Specifically, the general stated he would have kept the troops in place until the conclusion of the 2012 summer fighting season.

That being said, I have absolute confidence in our new commander, GEN John Allen. He succeeds General Petraeus, with whom I met over there in Afghanistan, and have met on other occasions, and who has done a tremendous singular service for our country. I have great respect for him. But I expect General Allen to be just as good. General Allen was one of the vital catalysts in the Sunni awakening in Iraq. The Sunni awakening and our counterinsurgency strategy are considered by many to be the driving forces for our success during the Iraqi surge. And, of course, we all remember what General Petraeus did there as well. I am confident General Allen will maintain the hard-won momentum our forces have achieved in Afghanistan, despite the reduction in resources.

In addition, our troops will be assisted by an even greater number of Afghan troops. In this month's edition of Foreign Affairs, General Rodriguez wrote that the Afghan Army by the end of 2010 had increased in size to 143,000, which surpassed that year's goal by

9,000 troops. In addition, the Afghan Army "has quickly become one of the country's most respected institutions." The general also writes:

In 2011, 95 percent of all Afghan army units have been partnered with coalition forces, and they are showing steady improvement in providing security and in their ability to independently thwart insurgent attacks.

In conclusion, much has been accomplished, but more remains to be done. The memory of that day—and those we lost—will be forever with us. We must never forget the hard lessons we learned on September 11. We must not become complacent or believe the threat is over or has gone. We have done much to mitigate the threats posed against us, but we always must be on guard for anything in the future.

The hallmark of our democracy consists of the principles of liberty and equality, cherished by our citizens. The terrorists who attacked us on September 11 saw the civic virtues of our peaceful Republic and wrongfully concluded that we were weak. As others have been reminded in the past, it is a mistake to underestimate the courage and resolve of Americans when our constitutional ideals come under attack or when our lives and liberties are threatened.

Even on that first day, the example of police and firemen charging into burning buildings at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and civilians fighting back above the skies of Shanksville, PA, showed to the world that America had not lost its resolve. To this day, we remain vigilant in our commitment to protect the natural rights to life and liberty announced in our Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by our beloved Constitution.

Ten years have followed since that day, but I remain proud of the example that America has set for the world as it continues its relentless pursuit of those who would kill innocents and plot mass terrorist attacks on civilian populations.

President Roosevelt called the attack on Pearl Harbor "a date which will live in infamy." Similarly, September 11, 2001, remains a day of remembrance and resolve. We will always remember those who were killed that day and the loved ones they left behind, and we resolve to secure justice for those victims by bringing justice to those responsible for the attacks and who continue to plot against us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted

to address the Senate as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last night we gathered in the House Chamber for a joint session to listen to President Obama speak about our Nation's dire need to get our economy growing more strongly, to create jobs, and to get millions of Americans back to work. All Americans share this goal, even as we may have some disagreements over the best way to do it.

I think one way to create jobs most of us would agree on is opening new markets overseas to American workers, products and trade. U.S. products are the finest in the world, and we must lower barriers that impede free trade. To that end, we heard the President repeat, as he has previously on numerous occasions in speaking to Congress and the American people, that we must lower barriers that impede free trade. To that end, we heard the President say last night that he wants Congress to pass the three free-trade agreements, with Korea, Colombia, and Panama, that were concluded many years ago. I could not agree more.

Indeed, the International Trade Commission estimates that passing these three trade agreements could increase U.S. exports by \$13 billion, creating approximately 250,000 new jobs.

So Republicans in Congress and many Democrats are ready to pass these trade agreements. I believe if we had a vote on the merits of those agreements they would pass with strong bipartisan support just as previous trade agreements have. The problem is, they continue to sit on the President's desk where they have been since the day he took office. Until he sends those agreements to Congress, there is nothing we can do to pass them.

Why does the President continue to urge Congress to pass agreements that we cannot pass until they are submitted to Congress?

Considering that the President wants these agreements passed, and considering that Congress has the votes to pass them, and considering the overwhelming benefits that each of these free-trade agreements would bring to our workers and our economy, the obvious question, then, is, Why hasn't the President chosen to send these agreements to Congress for final approval?

The answer, I am afraid, has much to do with electoral politics. My friends on the other side of the aisle have long insisted that the price of getting trade agreements through Congress is passage of domestic spending bills geared to assist U.S. workers who have been adversely affected by foreign trade. For this reason, in 2002, Congress passed the trade adjusted assistance legisla-

tion that provided short-term support for worker retraining and other assistance. Many Republicans were skeptical about whether this program and others like it achieved their goals. But we went along for the sake of our national interest in expanding free trade.

However, in 2009, without any action taken on our three pending trade agreements, my friends on the other side of the aisle dramatically increased the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program as part of the stimulus bill, raising spending on this program annually by more than \$½ billion.

I might add that the stimulus bill was supposed to be a temporary stimulus. Now my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to make that increase permanent. In essence, a program that was designed to assist workers who had been adversely affected by free trade was transformed into a domestic slush fund for reasons that had nothing at all to do with expanding free trade.

What is worse, after repeatedly claiming it supports the free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and Korea, earlier this year the White House announced that the cost of its support was reauthorization of the new trade adjustment assistance, with funding not set at the original 2002 level but the 2009 stimulus level.

So here we had a program that had been expanded from its original cost under the dubious guise of a temporary economic stimulus, and then we were told this temporary funding increase, which was designed to expire along with the stimulus, should, in fact, be turned into a permanent domestic spending program.

My friends, this is why Americans are so angry with Washington and with Congress. It is this mentality that has led to the explosion of government spending and national debt in this country, and it is unsustainable.

I acknowledge that expanding trade does temporarily put some of our workers at a disadvantage. I remember being roundly criticized during the 2008 Presidential campaign when I had the audacity to tell Michigan workers the truth—that many of the jobs that had left their State for cheaper labor markets overseas were never coming back.

So I understand that trade can create difficulties for some American workers. I am not opposed in principle to supporting those workers temporarily so they can develop new skills, find new jobs. I don't oppose, nor do I seek to kill, trade adjustment assistance—just to restore it to its original 2002 levels. That said, for a minute let's look closer at how the Federal Government has been going about employment and worker training programs such as this.

Earlier this year, the Government Accountability Office released a study entitled "Multiple Training and Employment Programs: Providing Information on Co-Locating Services and Consolidating Administrative Struc-

tures Could Promote Efficiencies." A translation from the bureaucrats is, How is the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program working out? Here is what the GAO reported on Federal employment and retraining programs, including trade adjustment assistance:

The number of employment and training programs and their funding have increased since our 2003 report when we last reported on them. For fiscal year 2009, we identified 47 employment and training programs administered across nine agencies. Together, these programs spent approximately \$18 billion on employment and training services in fiscal year 2009, according to our survey data. This is an increase of 3 programs and about \$5 billion from our 2003 report. Adjusting for inflation, the amount of the increase is about \$2 billion.

They went on to say:

We estimate, based on survey responses, that this increase is likely due to temporary funding from the Recovery Act for 14 of the 47 programs we identified. In addition to increasing funding for existing programs, the Recovery Act [the stimulus package] also created 3 new programs and modified several existing programs' target population groups and eligibility requirements, according to agency officials. For example, the Recovery Act modified the Trade Adjustment Assistance program by expanding group eligibility to include certain dislocated service workers who were impacted by foreign trade.

So, according to the GAO, many of our multiplying employment and training programs are duplicative of other such programs funded by the Federal Government. But that is not all. The GAO continues:

Based on our survey of agency officials, we determined that only 5 of the 47 programs have had impact studies that assess whether the program is responsible for improved employment outcomes. The five impact studies generally found that the effects of participation were not consistent across programs, with only some demonstrating positive impacts that tended to be small, inconclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts.

I will repeat that last sentence:

The five impact studies generally found that the effects of participation were not consistent across programs, with only some demonstrating positive impacts that tended to be small, inconclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts.

Not only are many of these employment and training programs duplicative, the GAO has found very little empirical evidence to support whether these programs are even accomplishing their intended goals, and what empirical evidence they have found is, I repeat, "small, inconclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts."

Trade adjustment assistance is among these programs. So my question is simple: At this time of crushing Federal debt and increasing fiscal austerity, why should we increase spending on a program that is likely duplicated by other Federal efforts and of which we cannot even say for sure it is working?

The real tragedy is, because our trade agenda has ground to a halt over this disagreement, the people who are suffering most are our workers and America's international economic leadership. The United States may not be